DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 937 JC 840 408

AUTHOR Smith, Ronald C.
TITLE Why Program Review?
INSTITUTION Anchorage Community College, Alaska.
PUB DATE [84]
NOTE 28p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Formative Evaluation; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Anchorage Community College AK

ABSTRACT

The program review process described in this report was developed at Anchorage Community College (ACC) after 3 years of experimentation and adjustment. Following a brief overview of the factors that instigated the effort, the report sets forth the assumptions and definitions underpinning the review process. Next, a series of suggestions are presented for educators interested ir developing a formative review process, followed by a schedule of review tasks and a statement on the composition of the review committee. The report then outlines the performance criteria in the assessment of program quality; i.e., clear program goals; goal-congruent, instruction-related activities; consistency of the program with students' educational intent; integration of the curriculum with that of other programs and the institution as a whole; satisfactory vertical mobility (i.e., articulation with other ACC or university programs); effective personnel utilization; cost effectiveness; and strategic advantage. The next section identifies program review outcomes which include a program review data sheet containing information on enrollment history, student demographics, staffing patterns, degrees/certificates patterns, demand for the program, student follow-up, grades, staff development, budget, equipment, facilities, related programs, accreditation and advisory committee liaison; and a status report placing the program in a positive, conditional, probation, or terminal category. Finally, a program review manual provides additional detail on the process, staff responsibilities, and the data sheet. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED246937

WHY PROGRAM REVIEW?

Dr. Ronald C. Smith
Vice Chancellor of Instruction
Anchorage Community College
Anchorage, Alaska

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. C. SMITH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 840 408

WHY PROGRAM REVIEW?

Education in general, and community college education in particular, are under close scrutiny in our present atmosphere of declining funds, declining test scores, declining standards, declining quality of products, declining resolve of legislators, state and local governing boards to fully fund programs without clearcut objectives and documented outcomes. The need/access model portrayed by Clark Kerr in his publication, **The Uses of the University**, is the community college model and refers to the mission of the community college to provide access to those persons who can benefit from study and to make sure what is prepared (the menu) is what is needed. Community colleges must have ways of determining and demonstrating whether or not they are meeting these prescribed needs.

We made the decision at Anchorage Community College five years ago, in 1979, to develop a system of evaluating all college programs. Because we operate in a collective bargaining atmosphere, the Dean of Instruction pushed hard to exclude the program review process from the Instructional Advisory Council. The Dean believed that because there would be judgments made by peers, a conflict with the Contract would develop; additionally, the Dean wanted to be able to experiment, evaluate, and modify the process without a great deal of time lapsing between the perceived problems and the operational solutions. All academic directors were intimately involved in the development of the process. What we now have is the result of an evolution from a process that was summative, short-sighted, and rigid, to a process that is formative, future-oriented, and flexible.

Over a period of three years, we came to develop some assumptions about our academic program review process. Our assumptions are:

PROGRAM REVIEW IS AN EVALUATION PROCESS

PROGRAM REVIEW HAS ITS GREATEST USE IN POINTING THE WAY TO BETTER FUTURE PROGRAMS

PROGRAM REVIEW FACILITATES A DEMOCRATIC PLURALISTIC PROCESS BY ENLIGHTENING ALL THE PARTICIPANTS

PROGRAM REVIEWS SHOULD INFORM IN ORDER THAT A JUDGEMENT OF GOOD OR BAD CAN BE MADE

PROGRAM REVIEW IS A FEEDBACK MECHANISM

PERSONS INVOLVED IN THE PROGRAM'S OPERATION SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PROGRAM'S REVIEW

PROGRAM REVIEW MUST BE PART OF THE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES OF THE INSTITUTION

PROGRAM REVIEW SHOULD BE AN OPEN AND FLEXIBLE PROCESS

PROGRAM REVIEW IS NOT A SUBSTITUTE FOR GOOD SUBJECTIVE DECISION-MAKING OR FOR KNOWLEDGE/EXPERIENCE THAT REACHES BEYOND THE DATA

PROGRAM REVIEW PROVIDES A CLARIFICATION THAT WOULD NOT OTHERWISE BE AVAILABLE

PROGRAM REVIEW ASSISTS IN MAINTAINING QUALITY, RELEVANCE AND COST EFFECTIVENESS OF PROGRAMS

To insure that all disciplines were reviewed, we developed a very broad definition of 'program.' Our definition of an instructional program is: A planned sequence of courses, services or other educational activities specifically associated with a designated set of objectives. This definition allows for those educational experiences that do not lead to degrees or certificates to be included in our review process. With this definition, we have forty-seven programs. Because we have decided to review each program on a three-year cycle, we must review , at minimum, fifteen programs yearly. We must closely scrutinize this practice, for it is very difficult to use results of the reviews in our planning/budgeting process. The timing of completion of the reviews is a problem that must be resolved.

For clarity of purpose, we adopted a definition of the review process as follows: A formative evaluation designed to bring about systematic improvement in programs, to identify program needs so that resources of the institution may be appropriately applied and to assist in curriculum and staff development. This 'formative evaluation' assumes that a planning process is in place and that staff development is a priority for the institution. It also assumes an Office of Institutional Research or its equivalent is in place, for the collection of data is extremely important to the process and academic directors cannot be expected to perform the data gathering tasks without assistance.

THE PROCESS

The following is a chronology of the review process used by Anchorage Community College. This process is the result of three years experimenting and adjusting and is not yet considered final. A statement is timely here for those items to pay particular attention to when one decides to develop a Program Review Process.

The purpose of Program Review should be widely disseminated and concensus gained with the academic staff. Do not hurry through this stage, as it will save one much back-lash later on; the time is well spent.

Do not initiate a Program Review process when the institution is under stress. As the review process will always be viewed by some as threatening and not necessary, as many faculty will say,'I know as much as there is to know about my program." Additionally, it will be difficult to get personnel to 'buy in' to the process if there already exist a 'cause celebre.'

Understand that the Review must be completed at the lowest possible administrative level and that department heads and division directors must engage in dialogue with faculty and, if appropriate, advisory committees, to effect the completion of such review. **It is important that they understand that the purpose of the Review is not to proselytize or to seek more space, or to gain more faculty, or to delete their program.** While such items may indeed be by-products of the review, the purpose of the review should be none of these, per se.

Administrators closest to the Review process should be closely associated with the 'committees' at each step of the process to reduce the probability of an incomplete, unacceptable, or otherwise poor document.

At the end of the Review process a written decision must be made by the Asministrative head of Instruction as to the status of the program and communicated to all affected and interested parties. If recommendations from the review committee are part of the process, responses to those recommendations should be included as part of the written decision. The decision-making process should be clearly delineated before the process commences. This report should be completed as soon as possible to maintain credibility with those who have undergone an extensive and comprehensive process that has become an extension of their beliefs, knowledge, and understandings of a program to which they have a visceral attachment.

Attempt to time the completion of Reviews to coincide with the proper moment in your planning process. If the results of reviews do not become more data and information that can assist in the administration of and management of academic programs for the future, they are probably not worth the effort to develop and prepare.

Do all that you can to lend credibility to the Review process. The more things you can do in advance of initiating a Review process that gives it status and importance, the more serious academic personnel will view the process. Emphasize the need to maintain quality and accountability for programs in lieu of reducing resources, retrenchment, or deletion of programs.

Maintain flexibility in the kind of criteria used for programs. Anticipate the problem of faculty viewing criteria 'not applicable' to their program by developing specific criteria for vocational and academic programs. Additionally, allow for participants in each review to add specific criteria they believe to be pertinent... encourage them to do so.

Maintain a sense of humor...

ANCHORAGE COMMUNITY COLLEGE'S INSTRUCTIONAL REVIEW PROCESS

Review Tasks and Time Line

Each program will be reviewed once every three years.

Director establishes a review committee for each program under review	August/ September
Vice Chancellor negotiates any additional criteria (beyond those listed as core criteria below) upon which the program is to be reviewed	September
Current students are surveyed; specialized surveys, if used, are prepared	October
Program Review Data Sheets, prepared by Office of Institutional Research, are distributed to Review Committee	November/ January
Review Committee prepares report	January/ February
Director reviews and adds recommendations	April/ May
Vice Chancellor reviews and adds recommendations, and asks for administrative approval of Status Report; reports to Instructional Advisory Committee and forwards to the Chancellor	June
Chancellor communicates to Community College Council	July
Results used in planning next fiscal year's budgets	July/ August

Review Committee

Committees will consist of both those closely involved with the program (program faculty, students, director), faculty not in the program and community members (advisory committee members) where appropriate.

Performance Criteria in the Assessment of Quality

ACC uses the following eight criteria to assess the quality of its programs. These criteria require analysis of the degree to which the program is responsive to institutional objectives and student objectives, student outcomes, and effectiveness of resource allocations.

CORE CRITERIA

1. The **goals** of the program must be clear and their relationship to the goals of the college must be demonstrated. There should be evidence that the program has considered its goals and is able to reaffirm their appropriateness for the student population, the community and the goals of ACC.

2. The **instruction-related activities** of the program must be congruent with the program goals. The Review Committeee should consider whether the instructional techniques of the program are appropriate to its goals, whether supportive activities are congruent with the goals and whether outside-of-class activities are sufficient and are related.

3. **Curriculum integration** looks to the relationship between the curriculum of the program, the curriculum of other programs, and the total curriculum of the institution. The number of service courses provided for students enrolled in other programs, the number of students provided to service courses offered by other programs, and the availability of related curriculum options are elements of this criterion.

4. **Students' educational intent.** A social form would be providing access to higher education; a cultural form could be providing additional cultural activities to the college or the community; and an economic form could be training or retraining needed by business and industry.

5. **Satisfactory vertical mobility** is achieved when the program facilitates a student's shifting to other curricula within ACC and to UAA and other colleges without suffering undue loss of credits or time. The program is accountable for providing flexibility for students from other curricula of the college who wish to transfer into this curriculum. Satisfactory vertical mobility is achieved when program completers can move into related employment or transfer into baccalaureate programs; when program users can move into other courses with a greater sense of academic confidence.

6. **Effective personnel utilization.** Are the full-time faculty members used effectively? This criterion involves teaching load, advising load, curriculum development work, and college governance activities. How are part-time faculty used? Does their use complement full-time faculty so that institutional need for governance and curriculum development and student needs for advising and job placement are adequately met? Is administrative support required beyond the department head level normal, less than normal, or more than normal for programs of this kind? A related consideration should be the amount and kind of demands placed upon counseling services or upon the financial aid office of the institution..

7. **Cost effectiveness**, like personnel utilization, is a measure of resource utilization. Measures include the number of graduates or program completers produced by the program, the relationship of that number to the minimum acceptable to the college. Full-time equivalent and head count enrollment patterns in both the program and its primary courses must be considered, as well as the number of students attracted to the program. Equipment costs of each program should involve attention to obsolescence, replacement, and maintenance. A final consideration should be effective utilization of the facilities committed to the program and those shared with other programs, such as learning centers, libraries, laboratories, and shops.

8. What is the **strategic advantage** of this program? Other educational programs in Anchorage and the State, both public and private, may be providing a similar service. If this is the case, the program should present logical arguments as to why they are able to deliver the service better, more efficiently or in addition to these other providers. What are the national trends in this area? What is the strength of the department? What are the weaknesses of the department? Who are the people that affirm your assessment of strengths? How do others evaluate the programs? If program accreditation is relevant, describe the program's status.

These "core criteria" are adapted from criteria recommended at the 1982 ACCJC conference and published in an article by Darrel Clowes "Community College Program Review: A Model," Community College Review, Fall, 1981.

PROGRAM REVIEW OUTCOMES

The review process will result in a Program Review Document comprised of the:

Review Committee Report
Committee Recommendations and Highlights
Program Review Data Sheet
Directors Recommendations
Status Report (Vice Chancellor's Recommendations)

The Status Report or Vice Chancellor's Recommendations provides feedback to the program administrator and faculty on the administrative assessment of the review. The report may include recommendations, suggestions, and support for the committee conclusion. It must include a Status Report prepared by the Vice Chancellor which places the program in one of four categories:

1. **Positive** - the review was satisfactory and the program will not be considered by a Review Committee until the next scheduled review period in three years;

2. **Conditional** - there are deficiencies in the program's ability to meet institutional criteria (this shall result in an automatic assignment of the program to annual review status until it can move to **Positive** status);

3. **Probation** - the program has spent up to one year in the **Conditional** category and continues to have serious deficiencies; indicates an intent to terminate the program after one year with right of appeal to the Chancellor;

4. **Termination** - the final category recommended after a program has been classed as **Conditional** for up to one year, classed as Probation for up to one year, and continues to have serious deficiencies.

The Vice Chancellor forwards the recommendations on the reviewed program to the Chancellor and the appropriate councils for final disposition.

INSTRUCTIONAL

PROGRAM

REVIEW

REVISED JUNE 1983

Anchorage
Community College

CONTENTS

Review Process Overview . . . . . Blue

Program Review Committee Responsibilities . . . . . Green

Program Review Data Sheet . . . . . Pink

Director's and Dean's Responsibilities. . . . . Yellow

ANCHORAGE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
REVIEW PROCESS OVERVIEW

DEFINITIONS

Instructional Program. A planned sequence of courses, services or other educational activities specifically associated with a designated set of objectives.

Review Process. A formative evaluation designed to bring about systematic improvement in programs, to identify program needs so that resources of the institution may be appropriately applied and to assist in curriculum and staff development.

REVIEW TASKS AND TIME LINE

Each program will be reviewed at least once every three years.

August/September. Director establishes a Review Committee for each program under review. Committee must include at least one member from outside the program faculty. Use of advisory committee members and students is encouraged.

September. Dean negotiates any additional criteria (beyond those listed as core criteria below) upon which the program is to be reviewed.

October. Current students are surveyed by the Office of Institutional Research; specialized surveys, if used, are prepared in cooperation with the Office of Institutional Research (must have design completed by December 15).

September to February. Review Committee prepares report (working on core criteria 1, 2, and 3 prior to receipt of Data Sheet and other criteria after Data Sheet is received).

November/December. A Program Review Data Sheet, prepared by Office of Institutional Research, is distributed to Review Committee.

March 1. Review Committee submits "Committee Report" and "Highlights" to the Director.

April 1. Director submits Committee Report and Highlights, with Director's Recommendation, to Dean.

May 1. Dean reviews, adds Dean's Status Report, and forwards to the Chancellor and appropriate councils.

June 1. Chancellor communicates overall results of reviews to the Community College Council.

REVIEW COMMITTEE

Committee will consist of both those closely involved with the program (program faculty, students, director), faculty not in the program, and community members (advisory committee members) where appropriate.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA IN THE ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY

ACC uses the eight criteria described below as core criteria to assess the quality of its programs. These criteria require analysis of the degree to which the program is responsive to institutional objectives and student objectives, student outcomes, and effectiveness of resource allocations.

CORE CRITERIA

The core criteria are adapted from criteria recommended at the 1982 AACJC conference and published in an article by Darrel Clowes, "Community College Program Review: A Model," Community College Review, Fall 1981.

1. Program goals must be clear and their relationship to the goals of the college must be demonstrated. There should be evidence that the program has considered its goals and is able to reaffirm their appropriateness for the

student population, the community, and the goals of ACC. Program objectives for the next three years should be developed. These objectives are to be consistent with resource limits.

2. Instruction-related activities of the program must be congruent with the program goals. The Review Committee should consider whether the instructional techniques of the program are appropriate to its goals, whether supportive activities are congruent with the goals, and whether outside-of-class activities are sufficient and related.

3. Curriculum integration looks to the relationship between the curriculum of the program, the curriculum of other programs, and the total curriculum of the institution. The number of service courses provided for students enrolled in other programs, the number of students provided to service courses offered by other programs, and the availability of related curriculum options are elements of this criterion.

4. Students' educational intent: A social form would be providing access to higher education; a cultural form could be providing additional cultural activities to the college or the community; and an economic form could be training or retraining needed by business and industry.

5. Satisfactory vertical mobility is achieved when the program facilitates a student's shifting to other curricula within ACC and to UAA and other colleges without suffering undue loss of credits or time. The program is accountable for providing flexibility for students from other curricula of the college who wish to transfer into this curriculum. Satisfactory vertical mobility is achieved when program completers can move into related employment or transfer into baccaulaureate programs; when program users can move into other courses with a greater sense of academic confidence.

6. Effective personnel utilization: Are the full-time faculty members utilized effectively? This criterion involves teaching load, advising load, curriculum development work, and college governance activities. How are part-time faculty utilized? Does utilization complement full-time faculty so that institutional need for governance and curriculum development and student needs for advising and job placement are adequately met? Is administrative support required beyond the department head level normal, less than normal, or more than normal for programs of this kind?

A related consideration should be the amount and kind of demands placed upon counseling services or upon the financial aid office of the institution.

7. Cost effectiveness, like personnel utilization, is a measure of resource utilization. Measures include the number of graduates or program completers produced by the program and the relationship of that number to the minimum acceptable to the college. Full-time equivalent and head-count enrollment patterns in both the program and its primary courses must be considered, as well as the number of students attracted to the program. Equipment costs of each program should involve attention to obsolescence, replacement, and maintenance. A final consideration should be effective utilization of the facilities committed to the program and those shared with other programs, such as learning centers, libraries, laboratories, and shops.

8. Strategic advantage is achieved when the program provides a unique response to a demonstrated community need. Other educational programs in Anchorage and the State, both public and private, may be providing a similar service. If this is the case, the Review Committee should present logical arguments as to why the program has a strategic advantage. What are the national trends in this area? What are the strengths of the program? What are the weaknesses of the program? How do others evaluate the program? If program accreditation is relevant, describe the program's status.

DEAN'S STATUS REPORT

The Dean's Status Report provides feedback to the program administrator and faculty on the administrative evaluation of the program. The report may include recommendations, suggestions, and support for the committee conclusion. It must include a statement about the program's status in one of four categories:

Positive. The review was satisfactory and the program will not be analyzed until the next scheduled review period in three years.

Conditional. There are deficiencies in the program's ability to meet institutional criteria (this

shall result in an automatic assignment of the program to annual review status until it can move to Positive status).

Probation. The program has spent up to one year in the Conditional category and continues to have serious deficiencies; indicates an intent to terminate the program after one year with right of appeal to the Chancellor.

Termination. The final category recommended after a program has been classed as Conditional for up to one year, classed as Probation for up to one year, and continues to have serious deficiencies.

The Dean forwards the recommendations on the reviewed program to the Chancellor and the appropriate councils.

PROGRAM REVIEW OUTCOMES

Unabridged Final Program Review Document for Each Program:

CONTENT	AUTHOR	DATE COMPLETED
Program Review Data Sheet	Office of Institutional Research	January 1
Committee Report	Review Committee	March 1
Highlights	Review Committee	March 1
Director's Recommendation	Program Director	April 1
Dean's Status Report	Dean of Instruction	May 1

A copy of each unabridged review document is maintained by the Dean of Instruction, program Director, and Office of Institutional Research.

Summary of Each Fiscal Year's Program Review Process:

CONTENT	AUTHOR	DATE COMPLETED
Programs Reviewed and Resulting Status	Edited by Office of Institutional Research	May 1
Review Process Summary	Office of Institutional Research	June 1
For Each Program: Highlights Committee Recommendations (from Committee Report) Director's Recommendation Dean's Status Report	Edited by Office of Institutional Research	June 1

Copies will be available for the Community College Council, Statewide Administration, Advisory Council members, Faculty, Counselors, and Administrators. This document will serve as a basic resource for the planning process.

ANCHORAGE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

The Review Committee is responsible for evaluating the program on the eight core criteria plus any additional criteria established in consultation with the Dean of Instruction. The Review Committee is responsible for preparing a Committee Report and Highlights as described below.

COMMITTEE TASKS AND TIME LINE

August/September. Director establishes Review Committee.

September. Criteria in addition to core criteria, if any, are negotiated with Dean of Instruction.

October to November. Review Committee completes review of program goals and instructional activities.

November to December. Program Review Data Sheet with statistical information about the program is provided to the Review Committee by the Office of Institutional Research.

December to February. Review Committee completes review of program based on remaining criteria and prepares Committee Report and Highlights.

March 1. Review Committee submits Committee Report and Highlights to Director.

April 1. Director reviews Committee Report and Highlights and adds Director's Recommendation.

May 1. Dean reviews Committee Report, Highlights, and Director's Recommendation and provides the Dean's Status Report which is communicated to program faculty and Director, Chancellor, and appropriate councils.

COMMITTEE REPORT

Evaluation based on eight core criteria common to all programs and any additional criteria negotiated with the Dean. This evaluation will require discussion of program objectives and evaluation of the data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, Program Review Data Sheet. Programs using specialized surveys should negotiate evaluation criteria related to the survey intent. Programs providing vocational education should establish criteria relevant to industry expectations. Likewise, programs with outreach functions should establish criteria related to outreach.

The Committee Report will consist of the following:

Cover Page. Anchorage Community College Program Review for x program, academic year. Submitted by Committee Member names to Director's name and Dean's name on date.

Table of Contents.

Goals of the Program. List the program goals. Discuss these goals in relationship to criterion 1 which states: "Program goals must be clear and their relationship to the goals of the college must be demonstrated. There should be evidence that the program has considered its goals and is able to reaffirm their appropriateness for the student population, the community, and the goals of ACC. Program objectives for the next three years should be developed. These objectives are to be consistent with resource limits."

Instructional Activities. Describe the teaching methods, student advising opportunities, outreach, and other instructional activities. Evaluate these in relationship to criterion 2 which states: "Instruction-related activities of the program must be congruent with the program goals. The Review Committee should consider whether the instructional techniques of the program are appropriate to its goals, whether supportive activities are congruent with the goals, and whether outside-of-class activities are sufficient and related."

Curriculum Integration. Describe the curriculum in terms of which courses are service, "major," community oriented, job upgrade, basic skills, etc. How does the curriculum relate to the rest of the college, to efforts to serve the entire Anchorage area (military offerings, South Anchorage, etc.), to telecommunications? Evaluate the curriculum in relationship to criterion 3 which states: "Curriculum integration looks to the relationship between the curriculum of the program, the curriculum of other programs, and the total curriculum of the institution. The number of service courses provided for students enrolled in other programs, the number of students provided to service courses offered by other programs, and the availability of related curriculum options are elements of this criterion."

Student Education Intent. Review the information on student demographics and any follow-up studies. Is the program serving the audience intended? Are the program goals and student objectives consistent? Is the pattern of offerings appropriate to student needs? In vocational education, are the students being placed in jobs at a reasonable rate, and are there sufficient job openings in Alaska to be consistent with student intent and program goals? The sections of the Program Review Data Sheet called "Student Demographics" especially under "Student Objective for Enrolling," "Projected Labor Demand," and "Degree and Certificate Pattern" will be particularly helpful. Evaluate findings in relationship to criterion 4 which states: "Students' educational intent: A social form would be providing access to higher education; a cultural form could be providing additional cultural activities to the college or the community; and an economic form could be training or retraining needed by business and industry."

Vertical Mobility. Review the program goals which relate to vertical mobility. Provide evidence that your program is achieving that mobility. The sections in the Program Review Data Sheet called "Degrees and Certificate Pattern" and "Grades" will be particularly helpful. Follow-up studies and anecdotal information may also be useful. Discuss articulation with related programs at the Anchorage School District. Evaluate findings in relationship to criterion 5 which states: "Satisfactory vertical mobility is achieved when the

program facilitates a student's shifting to other curricula within ACC and to UAA and other colleges without suffering undue loss of credits or time. The program is accountable for providing flexibility for students from other curricula of the college who wish to transfer into this curriculum. Satisfactory vertical mobility is achieved when program completers can move into related employment or transfer into baccalaureate programs; when program users can move into other courses with a greater sense of academic confidence."

Effective Personnel Utilization. Review staffing pattern information. Describe the demand for services from other areas such as Counseling Services, library, Learning Resources Center, math lab, Developmental Studies, Reading/Writing Lab, Women's Center, Computer Center, etc. Discuss the staff development activities (Professional Development Leaves, trips, in-service) of the past two years and future plans. How are faculty and staff evaluated and what have these evaluations revealed about the effectiveness of instruction? The sections in the Program Review Data Sheet called "Staffing Patterns" and "Staff Development History" will be particularly useful. Evaluate the staffing pattern in relationship to criterion 6 which states: "Effective personnel utilization: Are the full-time faculty members utilized effectively? This criterion involves teaching load, advising load, curriculum development work, and college governance activities. How are part-time faculty utilized? Does utilization complement full-time faculty so that institutional need for governance and curriculum development and student needs for advising and job placement are adequately met? Is administrative support required beyond the department head level normal, less than normal, or more than normal for programs of this kind? A related consideration should be the amount and kind of demands placed upon counseling services or upon the financial aid office of the institution."

Cost-effectiveness. Review the student credit hour to faculty ratio and the faculty to support staff ratio from "Staffing Patterns" section of the Program Review Data Sheet. Discuss the operating budget and equipment costs of the program. If any of the cost-effectiveness measures vary significantly from the norm

for similar programs the variance should be explained. Evaluate the cost-effectiveness of the program in relationship to criterion 7 which states: "Cost effectiveness, like personnel utilization, is a measure of resource utilization. Measures include the number of graduates or program completers produced by the program and the relationship of that number to the minimum acceptable to the college. Full-time equivalent and headcount enrollment patterns in both the program and its primary courses must be considered, as well as the number of students attracted to the program. Equipment costs of each program should involve attention to obsolescence, replacement, and maintenance. A final consideration should be effective utilization of the facilities committed to the program and those shared with other programs, such as learning centers, libraries, laboratories, and shops."

Strategic Advantage. Describe how any other similar programs compare to this program. Explain the need for duplication, if appropriate. Briefly describe what is happening in this type of program nationwide. How does ACC's program compare? Refer to letters of support, articulation, etc. for this program (attach in an appendix). The section in the Program Review Data Sheet called "Related Programs" will be helpful. Evaluate findings in relationship to criterion 8 which states: "Strategic advantage is achieved when the program provides a unique response to a demonstrated community need. Other educational programs in Anchorage and the State, both public and private, may be providing a similar service. If this is the case, the Review Committee should present logical arguments as to why the program has a strategic advantage. What are the national trends in this area? What are the strengths of the program? What are the weaknesses of the program? How do others evaluate the program? If program accreditation is relevant, describe the program's status."

Recommendations. Describe what needs to be done to increase this program's effectiveness in the next three years. If recommendations require additional funding, be specific about the amount of money and year in which money is needed (reallocation funds could meet next year's needs;

new legislative funding must be requested two years in advance). Provide recommendations for all of the following areas:

+ Curriculum
+ Pattern of course offerings
+ Number and responsibilities of teachers
+ Number and responsibilities of support staff
+ Non-salary budget (commodities, contractual, local travel)
+ Equipment (only items costing $500 or more)
+ Space (lecture, lab, storage, faculty offices, staff offices)
+ Staff development (list the plans for Professional Development Leave, faculty exchange, and faculty and staff travel)
+ Students served (indicate outreach activities desired, total number of students expected to be served each year for three years)
+ Community liaison
+ Liaison with related programs in the state
+ Accreditation (if relevant)

FORMAT

It is recommended that the report format follow these standards:

+ Single-spaced to avoid bulk.

+ Bound in a manner that is easy to take apart for duplication and for addition of the Director's Recommendation, Dean's Status Report, and Program Review Data Sheet.

+ Headings underlined above in the "Committee Report" section should be highlighted for ease of reading.

HIGHLIGHTS

This is to be an "executive summary" of the strengths of the program and areas needing change for program improvement. It should be designed for those who will not read the entire Committee Report. This two or three page summary should be written after the Committee Report is completed and should be submitted to the Director by March 1.

DISTRIBUTION

Four copies of the Committee Report and of the Highlights should be submitted to the Director by March 1. Copies will be retained as follows:

+ Dean of Instruction
+ Office of Institutional Research
+ Chancellor
+ Director (copy will be returned after Dean of Instruction completes the Dean's Status Report)

OIR 6/7/83

ANCHORAGE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW DATA SHEET

The Office of Institutional Research is responsible for preparing a Data Sheet on each program. The Data Sheet is to be included in the unabridged Program Review Document maintained on each program. The data is drawn from a survey of current students, ISIS data files, DOL information and documents prepared by the Office of Institutional Planning, Statewide. The data will be reported in such a manner that it is comparable from program to program and accurately reflects the program.

Enrollment History. The enrollment pattern for the past three years in the program as a whole and in each course. Data will be based on the enrollments as reported by ISIS and may reflect historical errors in record-keeping that are currently being corrected. The percentage of the total U of A lower division enrollment represented by the ACC program will be indicated.

Student Demographics. Comparision of student sex, race, age, previous education, credits carried, employment status for students in this program versus students at ACC in general. Demographics are listed both for enrolled students and for majors where appropriate. Students' reasons for enrolling in the program will be listed. Possible objectives for enrolling are:

+ Improve current job skills
+ Prepare for a new job
+ Advance in current related job
+ Meet personal interests
+ Obtain credits or degree for transfer
+ Complete high school or GED
+ Develop basic skills
+ Other

Staffing Patterns and Utilization. Numbers and status of instructors and support staff will be listed. Support staff to faculty and student to faculty ratios will be provided for both the program and the college as a whole.

Degrees and Certificates Pattern (where appropriate). The number of degrees and certificates awarded will be listed for three years. Comparison to other similar programs will be provided. The number of students who have

paid $10 to declare their interest to major and the number of students surveyed who declared an interest in a degree or certificate at ACC will be provided. The most current degree requirements will be listed.

Demand for Program. For vocational programs the Department of Labor occupational demand data will be provided. For other programs, information from available interest surveys will be summarized. Many programs have no quantifiable data other than enrollments on demand and will need to provide a subjective evaluation in the Committee Report. A trend line for future enrollments will be provided for all programs based upon Anchorage population increases, program changes, and resource limitations.

Student Follow-up. Data from any relevant follow-up studies will be presented. Programs with anecdotal follow-up information (transfer student reports, letters of appreciation) should comment on these in the Committee Report under Vertical Mobility and Student Educational Intent.

Grades. Semester grades awarded in the program compared to ACC as a whole and similar courses offered elsewhere in the U of A.

Staff Development History. The college-sponsored trips and PDL for faculty and staff for the past year will be listed. The Review Committee should also comment upon participation in in-service workshops, classes, and other staff development activities.

Budget (Non-salary). Budget of the department for the current year. Income statement if student fees are charged. Non-salary cost per credit (or contact) hour for this program versus same cost per credit hour for the college as a whole.

Equipment. Total dollar value of equipment. Programs with significant equipment needs should address them in the Committee Report.

Facilities. Current square footage of ACC-controlled space, by lecture, lab, and office and storage space. Number of work stations where appropriate. Any space needs already identified by the Facilities Planning Committee will be listed.

Increment Status. Description and status report on any operational capital increments or reallocation proposals which will affect the department for current year and next year.

Related Programs. List of others in Alaska offering similar courses. Number of degrees offered by others, percent of total U of A grades awarded by the ACC program.

Accreditation. Current status, if program is eligible for professional accreditation.

Advisory Committee/Community Liaison. Description of the community groups most closely related to this program.

OIR 6/7/83

ANCHORAGE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW
DIRECTOR'S AND DEAN'S RESPONSIBILITIES

DIRECTOR'S RESPONSIBILITIES

+ Establish Review Committee in early fall.

+ Assure that Review Committee is meeting the time line.

+ Provide conduit for information to Review Committee.

+ Write Director's Recommendation. This recommendation is added by the Director after the Review Committee completes its Committee Review and Highlights, and before forwarding to the Dean (no later than April 1). It should review strengths and weaknesses of the Committee Review. It may include recommendations, suggestions, and support of any items in the review document. All Review Committee members and other faculty in the program will receive a copy of the Director's Recommendation.

DEAN'S RESPONSIBILITIES

+ Review the completed Committee Review, Highlights, and Director's Recommendation, and prepare a Dean's Status Report in response no later than May 1.

+ Forward the Dean's Status Report to the Chancellor and appropriate councils.

ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

SEP 07 1984

8118 Math-Sciences Building
Los Angeles, California 90024